

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, and 13-15 are now pending in the application. By this paper, claims 1, 13, and 15 are amended. Support for the amendments is found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings, including paragraphs [0048] to [0049]. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION

Applicants note that paragraph 9 of the Office Action Summary mailed April 26, 2010 indicates that the specification is objected to by the Examiner. However, the body of the Office Action mailed April 26, 2010 does not include any objections to the specification. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the box next to paragraph 9 of the Office Action Summary mailed April 26, 2010 appears to have been checked in error.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, and 13-15 stand objected to due to certain informalities. The objections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 stands objected to as containing two limitations that appear to be duplicates of each other. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's characterization of the limitations of, and the objection to, claim 1. Applicants note that claim 1 recites a request being generated by execution by the user of a short-cut link on a desktop screen of the computer. Further, Applicants note that claim 1 also recites transmitting an e-mail to

the user having a link that is the same as the short-cut link on the desktop screen of the computer, execution by the user of the link generating a request for offering information of the product from the user. Applicants respectfully note that the two separate limitations are not duplicates of each other. In the first instance, the request is generated by execution of the short-cut link on the desktop screen of the computer. In the second instance, the request is generated by the user executing a link in an e-mail sent to the user by the production management server. These are different limitations. To expedite prosecution, however, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that, in the second instance, the link that is executed is “the link in the e-mail” that generates the request. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 also stands objected to as requiring a semicolon after “computer” at line 24 of amended claim 1. For the reasons discussed above, Applicants have not deleted the limitations following the recited “computer” at line 24 of amended claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that a comma is more appropriate than a semicolon after the recited “computer.” Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Claims 13 and 14 stand objected to based on the omission of the word “request.” Applicants have amended claims 13 and 14 according to the Examiner’s suggestion. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,240,420), HTML 4.01 Specification, and Vasnani (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0006693). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a product management system including a production management server and an information offering apparatus for offering, via a communication network, information to a user of a product comprising a computer produced by combining parts selected from a plurality of parts, the information offering apparatus comprising a production management server that sends an assembling instruction to a client computer in an assembly plant to assemble the computer. The assembly instruction indicates the parts selected from the plurality of parts by the user. The client computer has an inspection program for inspecting whether the computer is assembled in accordance with the assembling instruction. The client computer sends information indicating a completion of inspection to the production management server. The production management server, upon receiving the information indicating the completion of the inspection of the computer, forms and transmits an e-mail to the user having a link that is the same as the short-cut link on the desktop screen of the computer. Execution by the user of the link in the e-mail generates a request for offering information of the product from the user that is received by the request-receiving means of the information offering apparatus via the communication network. The prior art fails to teach or suggest the product management system recited by claim 1.

For example, Lee describes the use of menu windows 700, 720, and 740 to select a user wanted item, for example a FAQ on the HDD device model M555D. See Lee, Figure 7. In the previous Office Action, the Examiner characterizes this section of Lee as suggesting “that a customer, after inspection of his/her M555D model, finds that he/she would like to access the FAQ related to the HDD of his/her M555D model in order to find a solution to a HDD-related problem...”. See Office Action, 4/26/2010, p. 9. Applicants respectfully note, however, that the type of inspection on the customer side, as described in the Examiner’s characterization of Lee, *is not* the type of inspection recited by claim 1. Specifically, the inspection recited by claim 1 is carried out on the manufacturing side through a client computer in an assembly plant that has an inspection program for inspecting whether the user’s computer is assembled in accordance with the assembling instruction. As recited by claim 1, the client computer sends information indicating a completion of inspection to the production management server and, upon receiving the information, the production management server forms and transmits an e-mail to the user having a link that is the same as the short-cut link on the desktop screen of the computer. Lee is silent with respect to these limitations of claim 1.

For at least these reasons, the prior art fails to teach or suggest the product management system recited by claim 1, which defines over the prior art. Claims 2-4, and 7-9 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and likewise define over the prior art. Limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 are also recited by claim 13. For at least the above reasons, claim 13 likewise defines over the

prior art. Claims 14-15 depend from claim 13 and likewise define over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,240,420), HTML 4.01 Specification, Vasnani (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0006693) and Meyer (U.S. Pat. No. 6,826,715). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 depends indirectly from claim 1, which defines over the prior art as discussed above. For at least the above reasons, claim 6 likewise defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,240,420) and HTML 4.01 Specification, and Vasnani (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0006693) and further in view of Sidie (U.S. Pat. No. 6,170,056). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 11 depends indirectly from claim 1, which defines over the prior art as discussed above. For at least the above reasons, claim 11 likewise defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 26, 2010

By: /G. Gregory Schivley/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/MPD/mk

18470384.1